

## Remarks

This amendment is responsive to the official action of July 6, 2006, wherein the pending claims were rejected on the ground that the subject matter recited in claim 1 as amended lacked enablement in the specification.

Reconsideration is requested in view of this amendment. Fully enabling support for the subject matter questioned by the examiner can be found in paragraphs [0015] and [0022]. Furthermore, applicant has amended claim 1 to more closely mirror the language in the specification as filed.

The claims as amended are definite and supported in the disclosure as filed. There are no prior art rejections of record. The differences between the invention and the prior art are such that the subject matter claimed as a whole is not shown to have been known or obvious. Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

The latest official action questions the last two lines of claim 1 as amended in the preliminary amendment submitted with the request for continued examination. Support for such terminology was not found in the specification. These lines recited:

the fitting is configured such that an outer surface of the union nut is flush with an outer surface of the handgrip and acts as part of the handgrip

The following two paragraphs are found in the specification as originally filed, except that the paragraph numbers were inserted when the application was published by the PTO, and certain passages shown in boldface for emphasis were in plain type as filed:

**[0015]** The shower hose that conducts water from the water supply to the showerhead is usually attached to the end of the handgrip, which may also be the case for the hand-held shower attachment proposed by the invention. The fitting for attaching the

shower hose that is arranged on the end of the grip may be designed such that **a union nut attached to the end of the shower hose forms an extension of the grip such that the grip will be extended by the union nut**, which will allow further shortening that part of the grip into which the shower head is inserted. In other words, the longitudinal dimension of the union nut may be added to that of the grip when determining the overall length of the grip.

\* \* \*

**[0022]** FIG. 1 depicts a schematized side view of a shower attachment proposed by the invention. The shower attachment has a showerhead 1, which, in the case of the example shown, is discus-shaped. A surface 3 from which jets of water exit (cf. FIG. 2) is formed on its bottom 2, when it is oriented as shown in FIG. 1. A handgrip 4 on the showerhead 1 is attached to one side of this surface 3 from which jets of water exit. In the event that the shower attachment is fabricated from plastic, this handgrip 4 may be injection-molded onto it, thereby forming a monolithic structure. In the case of the example shown, the handgrip 4 is slightly curved, thereby roughly continuing the shape of the showerhead 1. A threaded fitting 5 whose outer diameter is slightly less than that of the remainder of the grip 4 is formed on the end of the handgrip 4. A union nut 6, indicated by the dashed lines, that is attached to the end of shower hose (not shown) may thus be screwed onto the threaded fitting 5. **The union nut 6 is designed such that its outer surface is flush with the outer surface of the handgrip 4.**

As shown by the cited passages, the subject matter of claim 1 as amended was supported in the specification as filed.

There is clearly no basis to object to claim 1 as amended on the ground that the substance of the claim lacks support. In order to further obviate any potential objection to the specific terms in claim 1, applicant has canceled the passage in claim 1 to which the examiner objects, and has inserted:

**wherein the union nut on the end of the shower hose forms an extension of the handgrip, the union nut having an outer surface that is flush with the outer surface of the handgrip, such that the handgrip is extended by the union nut.**

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The claim language is supported in the specification.

There is no assertion of record (and no basis for an assertion) that the person of ordinary skill would not understand what is meant by a union nut having an outer surface that is flush with the outer surface of a handgrip such that the union nut extends the handgrip.

All stated grounds of rejection are therefore overcome. The invention claimed as a whole is not disclosed in the prior art of record. The differences between the invention and the prior art are such that the subject matter claimed as a whole is not shown to have been obvious.

Allowance is requested of claims 1, 2 and 5-7.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 3, 2006

Docket Nos. D4700-380  
P42416US

/Stephan Gribok/  
Stephan P. Gribok, Reg. No. 29,643  
Duane Morris LLP  
30 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196  
tel. 215-979-1283  
fax. 215-979-1020  
SPGRIBOK@DUANEMORRIS.COM